

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of ANGELA MARIE WELSH,  
Minor.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, f/k/a  
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

UNPUBLISHED  
September 29, 2005

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

LAURIE ANN WELSH,

Respondent-Appellant.

No. 261123  
Oakland Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 03-683994-NA

---

Before: Fort Hood, P.J., and White and O'Connell, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in determining that the statutory ground for termination of parental rights was established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Respondent pleaded no contest to the allegations in the petition at the termination hearing, and a best interests hearing was held to determine whether respondent's parental rights should be terminated following respondent's psychiatric evaluation. The evidence showed that respondent failed to provide proper care or custody for Angela in the past. Respondent admitted to long-term, daily alcohol abuse. Respondent's neglect contributed to four-year old Angel's severe deficits; she was unable to communicate verbally, and she was not toilet trained or socialized.

Respondent was very motivated to achieve reunification with Angela and complied with most aspects of her parent agency agreement, notably maintaining sobriety throughout the course of this proceeding. However, respondent's cognitive limitations, combined with Angela's special need for hands-on speech and motor skills therapy by her caretaker, clearly showed that respondent was not able to provide the care that Angela required without continuous, intensive assistance. There was no reasonable expectation that respondent would be able to do so within a reasonable time, if ever. Less compelling factors in termination were respondent's lack of suitable housing and financial difficulty.

Finally, the evidence failed to establish that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. The child had special needs in her life that respondent was unable to address. See *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

Affirmed.

/s/ Karen M. Fort Hood

/s/ Helene N. White

/s/ Peter D. O'Connell